



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,889	10/20/2000	Yair Feld	00/20989	7655
7590	04/19/2005			EXAMINER FALK, ANNE MARIE
G. E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD. c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA SUITE 207 2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202			ART UNIT 1632	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/691,889	FELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.	1632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 23,24,28-35 and 40-60 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 23,24,28-33,35, 40, 42-46, 48-52, and 54-60 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 34,41,47 and 53 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/31/05 & 12/30/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed January 31, 2005 has been entered. Claims 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 35 have been amended. Claim 27 has been cancelled. Claims 40-60 have been newly added.

The rejection of Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for including new matter in the claim, is withdrawn in view of the amendment to the claim.

The rejection of Claims 23, 24, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koh et al. (1995) and Hoppe et al. (1999) is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 31, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Written Description

Claims 34, 41, 47, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants are referred to the final guidelines on written description published January 5, 2001 in the Federal Register at Volume 66, Number 4, pp. 1099-1111 (also available at www.uspto.gov).

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of ‘written description’ inquiry, whatever is claimed” (see page 1117). Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision.

The claims are directed to a method of modifying the electrophysiological function of an excitable tissue region by the specific method steps recited in the claims, wherein the method is utilized for “regulating secretion of endogenous factors from an organ including the excitable tissue region of the individual.” The claims are very broad in scope with regard to the endogenous factors and the organ including the excitable tissue. For example, the claims cover brain tissue and neurotransmitters that may be secreted into the brain. However, the specification only contemplates regulating secretion of glandular factors from glands (see for example page 8, lines 9-12 and lines 18-21). The specification does not contemplate regulating the release of neurotransmitters in the brain or elsewhere, nor does the specification contemplate regulating the secretion of other “endogenous factors” beyond glandular factors.

The Guidelines for Written Description specifically state that “[t]he claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described if the claims require an essential or critical feature which is not adequately described in the specification and which is not conventional in the art or known to one of ordinary skill in the art” (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, page 1105, column 1). The endogenous factors and their regulated secretion as recited in the claims are essential elements of the claimed invention.

Where the claims recite “endogenous factors,” the claims encompass a large genus of compounds that may be secreted from any excitable tissue within the animal body. However, the specification only contemplates regulating the secretion of glandular factors from glands. Thus, it is concluded that the written description requirement is not satisfied for the claimed methods of regulating secretion of endogenous factors from an organ including the excitable tissue.

Applicants are reminded that the written description requirement is severable from the enablement requirement. *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 194 USPQ 470 (CCPA 1977), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 1064 (1978); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1562, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (While acknowledging that some of its cases concerning the written description requirement and the enablement requirement are confusing, the Federal Circuit reaffirmed that under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the written description requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement and gave an example thereof). An invention may be described without the disclosure being enabling (e.g., a chemical compound for which there is no disclosed or apparent method of making), and a disclosure could be enabling without describing the invention (e.g., a specification describing a method of making and using a paint composition made of functionally defined ingredients within broad ranges would be enabling for formulations falling within the description but would not describe any specific formulation). See *In re Armbruster*, 512 F.2d 676, 677, 185 USPQ 152, 153 (CCPA 1975).

Art Unit: 1632

Claims 34, 41, 47, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for regulating secretion of an endogenous factor from a gland, does not reasonably provide enablement for regulating secretion of the very broad scope of endogenous factors from other organs comprising excitable tissue. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In view of the lack of written description for regulating secretion of endogenous factors from an organ, other than a gland, comprising excitable tissue, the specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for regulating secretion of the very broad scope of endogenous factors from the full scope of organs comprising excitable tissue.

Conclusion

Claims 23, 24, 28-33, 35, 40, 42-46, 48-52, and 54-60 are allowable.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history

Art Unit: 1632

information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne-Marie Falk whose telephone number is (571) 272-0728. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 10:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The central official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.

Anne-Marie Falk
ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER